Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 3, and 5-8 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 have been amended. Claims 2 and 4 were previously cancelled.

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claim 1 has been objected to because of the following informalities.

The Examiner stated that in claim 1, chromatic printing inks should be changed to chromatic printing inks CMY. Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the objection to claim 1 by the Examiner has been overcome.

The Examiner stated that in claim 1, from the first printing process should be changed to "of the first printing process". Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the objection to claim 1 by the Examiner has been overcome.

In item 3 on page 3 of the above-identified Office action, claim 3 has been objected to because of the following informalities.

The Examiner stated that in claim 3, chromatic printing inks should be changed to chromatic printing inks CMY. Claim 3 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the objection to claim 3 by the Examiner has been overcome.

The Examiner stated that in claim 3, the colors should be changed to "the colors of the first printing process". Claim 3 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the objection to claim 3 by the Examiner has been overcome.

In item 4 on page 4 of the above-identified Office action, claim 6 has been objected to because of the following informalities.

The Examiner stated that claim 6 should depend from claim 1 and not claim 4. Claim 6 has been amended to be in independent form. Therefore, the objection to claim 6 by the Examiner has been overcome.

Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the

matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

In item 7 on page 5 of the Office action, claims 1 and 3 have been rejected as being obvious over Decker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,281,984 B1) (hereinafter "Decker") in view of Fischer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,057,765 B1) (hereinafter "Decker"), Rolleston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,483,360) (hereinafter "Rolleston"), and Balasubramanian et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,534 B1) (hereinafter "Balasubramanian") under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on page 20, lines 10-15 of the specification.

In addition to the description on page 20, lines 10-15 of "s" being a function of C1, M, Y1 the above is also supported in claim 5. Accordingly, the function s is not a function of the black K.

Additionally, it is apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the main aspect of original claim 5 is the absence of the K-value in the formula. It is also apparent from claim 1 that chromatic printing inks do not include K. Therefore, the amendment is fully supported in the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

using a function s(C1,M1,Y1) for forming the weighting function f(C1,M1,Y1), which is limited to a value range between 0 and 1, the function s(C1,M1,Y1) being a measure of an entire proportion of only the chromatic printing inks CMY without black in a color of the first printing process.

The added limitation pertaining to the function "s" provides a further distinction to all the "smoothing functions", as disclosed in Rolleston, Fisher or Balasubramanian, since all the functions as proposed by Rolleston, Fisher or Balasubramanian, are functions of pixel values C, M, Y and K.

Moreover, since the proposed amendment is based on the main aspect of claim 5 and claim 5 is patentable, claim 1 is patentable as well.

Additionally, it is also pointed out that with the functions as proposed in the cited references, it is of importance what K-value is incorporated in a pixel, especially if the chromatic inks are in an average area. In the cited references, a high K-value leads to allocating a higher weighting factor to the colors of the second printing process and vice versa for a low K-value. Regarding the aspect of the present invention, disclosed on page 9, lines 11 to 21 of the specification, that the total maximum area coverage should be limited, switching to the maintaining of the black build-up in medium areas of color value C, M, Y would or could lead to exceeding the limit. Therefore, the problem is solved with defining a function "s" which only depends on chromatic printing inks and not on black.

The references do not lead to using a function s(C1,M1,Y1) for forming the weighting function f(C1,M1,Y1), which is limited to a value range between 0 and 1, the function s(C1,M1,Y1) being a measure of an entire proportion of only the chromatic printing inks CMY without black in a color of the first

printing process, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Therefore, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Since claim 1 is allowable, dependent claim 3 is allowable as well.

It is appreciatively noted from item 8 on page 21 of the Office action that claims 5-8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowable claim 5 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 is allowable.

Allowable claim 6 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 1. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable. Since claim 6 is allowable, dependent claims 7 and 8 are allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since

all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 3 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of 2 months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of $490 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alfred K. Dassler/

Alfred K. Dassler
Reg. No.: 52,794

AKD:sa

August 3, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101